

### Non-availability of Sugar in the State.

\*Q.—208. Smt. LAKSHMIDEVI RAMANNA (Chamarajpet).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether it has come to their notice that people are put to hardship due to non-availability of sugar in the market throughout the State;

(b) the steps taken by Government to remedy this hardship?

A.—Sri K. F. PATIL (Minister for Forest and Transport).—

(a) Sugar is available. Consequent on the imposition of Sugar (Movement) Control Order, 1959, by the Government of India, during August 1959, there was some dislocation in the supply position of sugar in certain parts of the State.

(b) The sugar released by the Government of India for local consumption from the Factories in this State is being allotted to the various districts on an equitable basis and arrangements have been made to ensure that the quota for each district is in turn distributed to rural and urban areas and arranged to be sold in retail through the dealers approved by the Deputy Commissioners of the districts concerned.

### PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri MALI MARIYAPPA (Minister for Co-operation).—I beg to lay on the Table a statement furnishing the information promised in connection with Question No. 156 regarding formation of Co-operative Units given notice of by Sri Abdul Rasheed.

### BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

#### Presentation of Thirteenth Report.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I beg to present the Thirteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee. Have the Members received a copy of the report?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I have not received the Report. I searched in the pigeon holes carefully.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Other members have received it.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Mangalore).—I move:

“That this Assembly agrees with the Thirteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That this Assembly agrees with the Thirteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.”

*The motion was adopted.*

### Non-Official Business.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri J. B. Mallaradhy to introduce the Bangalore City Tenants' Protection Bill, 1959. The member is not present.

### NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTION.

re: changing the Name of the State from “Mysore” to “Karnatak”

Mr. SPEAKER.—

“This Assembly is of the opinion that a recommendation be made to the Government of India to take necessary steps urgently to change the present name of Mysore State to Karnatak State.”

This resolution was moved by Sri M. Ramappa some time back. There was an amendment by Sri Deenadayalu Naidu, but it was not moved.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—I would like to make my position clear. The stage for moving my amendment had not come at that time. In fact, I was waiting eagerly from morning till evening to move that amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The stage for moving the amendment had come. I

shall read from the Brief Record of Business :

" Sri M. Ramappa moved the following resolution :

This Assembly is of the opinion that a recommendation be made to the Government of India to take necessary steps urgently to change the present name of Mysore State to Karnatak State."

Sri V. P. Deenadayalu Naidu who had given amendment to this Resolution was absent when his name was called. Sri Ramappa explained the need for bringing such a Resolution. He had not concluded when the House adjourned..."

†Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).— I rise to a point of order. The ballot for the 1st day of non-official business has been drawn. I do not find Sri Ramappa's resolution in the agenda for that day. I draw your attention to rule 28 (5) which says :

"The relative precedence of resolutions shall be determined by ballot held in accordance with the procedure set out in Schedule I."

According to the procedure set down in Schedule I, I believe the ballot has been drawn and this resolution has not got precedence. Probably, the Office has been led away by rule 17 which says :

"A motion, resolution or an amendment, which has been moved and is pending in the Assembly, shall not lapse by reason only of the prorogation of the Assembly."

It may not have lapsed, but all the same I submit that it should have been one of the resolutions which should have been balloted. I would like to draw your attention to rules 29 and 30 which are clear on the point. Rule 29 reads as follows :

"Private Members' business set down for the day allotted for that class of business and not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day, unless it has gained priority at

the ballot held with reference to that day :

"Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in rules 28 and 29 any such business which is under discussion at the end of that day shall be set down for the next day allotted to business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business set down for that day."

Rule 30 makes it further clear :

"(1) When on a motion being carried the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned to the next day allotted for Private Members' business in the same or next session, it will not be set down for further discussion unless it has gained priority at the ballot."

Even if it had been carried over for this session, it should have been one of the resolutions which should have been balloted and it should not have been carried over and set down in the business for today unless it had gained priority in the ballot. The next sub-rule makes it further clear :

"(2) When the debate on a Private members' Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, the member in charge of the Bill or the mover of the resolution, as the case may be, may, if he wishes to proceed with such Bill or resolution on a subsequent day allotted for Private member's business, give notice for resumption of the adjourned debate and on receipt of such notice the relative precedence of such Bill or resolution shall be determined by ballot."

In any case unless this resolution gains priority in the ballot, it cannot be put down for discussion today. Therefore I submit that permitting Sri Ramappa's resolution to be discussed would be out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to read rule 17.

"A motion, resolution or an amendment, which has been moved

(MR. SPEAKER)

and is pending in the Assembly shall not lapse by reason only of the prorogation of the Assembly."

So the position is clear so far as this is concerned.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Mangalore).—Before a ruling is given, I wish to submit a few words on this point. This is a very complicated point and perhaps it would be better on our part to place our views before the Speaker so that he may give a considered ruling. The relevant rules that arise for consideration are contained in Chapter IV containing rules 12 to 17. Normally when the Assembly is prorogued the sittings of the Assembly cease to be in operation and all business before the Assembly lapses except as provided in sub-rule (2) of rule 16, the exceptions being in respect of statutory motions, motions for amending rules, motions the considerations of which has been adjourned to the next session and Bills which have been introduced. We are not concerned with them here. Now coming to rule 17, it says :

"A motion, resolution or an amendment, which has been moved and is pending in the Assembly, shall not lapse by reason only of the prorogation of the Assembly."

I emphasise the words "shall not lapse". It is not that it shall have the same effect as it had before, but what is provided is that it shall not lapse merely by reason of the prorogation of the Assembly. This rule saves such a motion from lapsing. If it is kept alive, what exactly is the scope of it? That should be considered from rule 28. I shall not take the time of the House by referring to the whole of Rule 28. I will only refer to sub-rule (5) which says that "the relative precedence of resolutions shall be determined by ballot held in accordance with the procedure set out in Schedule I." Then I would refer the House to rule 29 which says: "Private members' business set down for the day allotted for that class of business and not disposed of..." I want to

emphasise the words "not disposed of". It does not say: not "not reached at all, or having reached, partly discussed and not finally disposed of". What the rule says is that such business "not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day..." But, at the same time, it can be further sub-divided into two categories: one, that has not been reached and the other, that has been reached. That is provided in the proviso.

'Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in rule 28 and 29 any such business which is under discussion at the end of that day shall...'

Sir, I emphasise the word "shall".

"...shall be set down for the next day allotted to business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business set down for that day."

Evidently, Sir, the word "shall" has been emphasised and the operation has been understood. There is no scope for any interpretation. It is considered on its own merit by virtue of the stage it has reached. There is a point on which we should bestow our thought. 'Shall' is not the only word; you have got the words 'is under discussion at the end of that day'. I want this further idea to be considered whether the unit that is to be considered is a unit of more than a sitting or only one sitting or all sessions despite the prorogation as a unit. If it is to be taken 'under discussion in any single session', the interpretation at the conclusion may have to be read in a particular manner. Here, we are having a thing not included here but pending from the last session. I learn, so far as this resolution now before the House is concerned, it has not been balloted at all. Whether it requires ballot, whether it should have priority, whether the words 'under discussion at the end of that day' should or should not be limited to the session as a unit, is the point to be considered. Now, we have commenced a session and started business.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Kindly read rule 30

sub-rule (2) also; he ought to have given notice.

**Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.**—I will come to it. Sir it is said, 'alloted to business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business...'.  
**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I want to know from the Hon'ble Member about this point. Please read rule 30 (1). "When on a motion being carried the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned to the next day allotted for Private Members' business in the same or next session, it will not be set down for further discussion unless it has gained priority at the ballot."

Does it not mean that there should be a motion for the adjournment of the debate? If there is no motion for adjournment, it is not covered by rule 30. Rule 30 contemplates the position where the motion for adjournment of a debate is contemplated.

**Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.**—Sir, you have anticipated me. I was considering Rule 29. If my interpretation of rule 29 is correct, Rule 30 does not come in at all. I may safely rule it out, if the suggestion is accepted, namely, it shall be on a motion. What is a motion, When that motion can be made? I will analyse this later. Now, what is the construction of rule 29? We have to think of a particular session end to end during the entire period. I submit that the word prorogation should also be considered. Prorogation means, all these are covered and we begin a fresh session. Rule 17 provides, that when a motion is before the House and it has been discussed and a stage is reached then it shall not lapse. Sir, what is the effect of the word 'does not lapse'? 'It does not lapse' only means that this is kept pending and it does not come within 29. Rule 29 relates to every session. Therefore, rule 30 is ruled out.

Coming to rule 30 (1), it says 'on a motion being carried'. That does not mean so far as the present context is concerned. That applies when a number of motions are pending.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I am only concerned with the interpretation of the words 'when on a motion being carried the debate on a Private Member's Bill or

resolution is adjourned to the next day.' That means, the motion of adjournment of the debate to the next day in the same session or to the next session should be there. I want to know the opinion of the Hon'ble Member on this. I believe that Rule 30 contemplates a situation in which a motion for adjournment of a debate is contemplated.

**Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.**—Sir, we have to catch the words as they are. The principle of interpretation is enunciated by the Hon'ble Speaker. But the wording found there is: "When on a motion being carried the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned." The  
10 A.M.

Speaker was pleased to ask whether sub-rule (1) of rule 30 would apply or not. I think it would not apply because there is no motion. The Hon'ble Member might have moved a motion at the time the House was about to adjourn and it might be taken up the next day so that rule 30 (1) might be applied. Sub-rule (1) does not come in as there is no motion. Then comes the question whether sub-rule (2) applies.

"When the debate on a Private Members' Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, the member in charge of the Bill or the mover of the resolution, as the case may be..."

**Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.**—It is a qualifying clause. It qualifies 30 (1). If there is a motion to carry the subject for the next day, then only Rule 30 (2) would apply but; not otherwise.

**Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.**—Simply because the rule has been mentioned as sub-rule (2), it does not become an appendage to sub-rule (1) and sub-rule (2) is to be interpreted as an appendage. Sub-rule (2) should have said that it is adjourned in accordance with sub-rule (1).

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Please read the proviso to rule 29.

"Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in rules 28 and 29, any such business which is under discussion at the end of that



(MR. SPEAKER)

day shall be set down for the next day allotted to business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business set down for that day."

Does it mean that it applies to the same session or a different session? Do you think that when a discussion on a resolution is going on and at the end of the day we find that it is still not concluded, it is continued to the next day? Do you think that the discussion is adjourned or continued? On these two points the Hon'ble Member may give me a reply.

The House now adjourns and will meet after half an hour.

*The House adjourned for recess at Five Minutes past Ten of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty-five Minutes past Ten of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I was referring to the provisions of Rule 30, sub-rule (1) and making my submission that if we took into account the normal interpretation of the words, we would find that every word has been put in there for the specific purpose of providing for special contingency, the essential contingency being that debating question should have been tagged on to a motion which has been carried to the effect that it is adjourned to the next day allotted for Private members' business in the same or next session. Sir, you will kindly recollect that the framers of the rule did not intend to have any distinction between one session and the next session. Sub-rule (1) is made to react to all on a chronological sequence, whether it is in the same session or the next session. Now to make my argument a little more clear and explicit, I may mention that if we read rule 29 with the same words 'in

the same session or in the next session' and particularly the proviso saying "provided that notwithstanding anything contained in rules 23 and 29 any such business which is under discussion at the end of that day shall be set down for the next session", there will be no doubt, so that if really the framers of the rule had an idea that 29 should operate regardless of one session or the next session, those words should have been used. Whether they have been unwittingly omitted, advisedly omitted is a matter for consideration. The real interpretation should be that there is some object in omitting or adding words. Therefore, Sir, rule 29 has to be read in the context in which it has been provided for and the specific provision that has been made there. Likewise rule 30 (1) referring to both aspects, namely, next day in that session, it is also possible that the next day may come in the next session. Anyway, on this occasion rule 30 (1) does not cover it, and I feel that rule 30 (1) does not come in. Then rule 30 (2). There again, I would like to emphasise the explicit words that have been used there. "When the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, that is, not any kind of adjournment, not a question of continuation, but it is a specific clause, namely, when it is adjourned *sine die*, the question arises, whether this motion which has been adjourned *sine die*, has not lapsed. It has been further complicated by the circumstance that the session had been prorogued. Sir, the words '*sine die*' simply mean that it has been adjourned for a later stage without having any specific date. The combined operation of rule 16 and rule 17 already provides for that and exception is being carved out purely in rule 17. One effect of this exception is that it does not lapse. Whether the effect of not lapsing brings it on a par with an adjournment *sine die* is a point for consideration. Rule 17 says that it shall not lapse and it does not fix any date. One interpretation of rule 29, proviso which says 'next day' is that it means the next working day or the next allotted day. On the other hand, the opinion on account of the combined effect of rule 17 and other

provisions is when it gets an adjournment *sine die*, it comes directly under sub-rule (2). One of the Hon'ble Members' objection was that sub-rule (2) was governed by sub-rule (1). No doubt there is some sort of easy notion about it. But I am perfectly right in mentioning that though sub-rules (1) and (2) are put under rule 30, they are not necessarily inter-linked because rule 30 (1) is altogether different. That does not come under sub-rule (2). At any rate it is more comprehensive than what is provided for under sub-rule (1).

Therefore the effect is, when it is adjourned *sine die*, the mover of the resolution or the Member in charge of the Bill, if he wishes to proceed with such resolution or Bill on a subsequent day allotted for Private Members' Business should give notice of the resumption of the adjourned debate and on receipt of the notice, the relative precedence of such Bill or resolution shall be determined by ballot. So, the decision of the Speaker must be that it is adjourned *sine die* because there is no knowing when it is going to be taken up. On the other hand, the interpretation of rule 29 is that there is no choice left and it must be necessarily taken on the next day because rule 29 proviso says that it shall be taken on the next day. It is not 'may be placed' but 'shall be placed'. The effect is that it shall not be put into ballot. That is so far as the scope of the resolution which has been concluded is concerned and it comes on its own merit. But so far as this is concerned, rule 30 (2) will come into operation. You will agree with the interpretation that it is adjourned *sine die* in which case notice of resumption has to be given. I do not know whether any such notice has been given and if notice has been given whether it has been included in the ballot. They are not right in thinking that this particular contingency may not have been thought of by the framers of the rule. Therefore, I was emphasising that rule 29 proviso should be interpreted along with rule 30 (2). I learn that this resolution has been placed not as a result of ballot. Therefore, if it is not put into the ballot and still printed there, it does not give

greater right. We shall try to ignore it altogether but the ballot is vitiated because it should have been included. In that connection, I present another aspect which seriously arises for consideration because in Schedule, I, whenever notice of a resolution is given, it has to be noted in the Register and if it is not disposed of or if it has not lapsed, it continues and at the time of ballot, the Register has to be looked into and everything that is pending should be included in the ballot. What will happen if there is failure to include them in the ballot? That aspect will arise.

I may draw your attention to sub-rule 3 of rule 31. This is exactly the reason why discretion is vested with the Speaker to solve difficulties of this type and to see that no individual member or a party gets a chance to entertain a grievance. Rule 31 (3) says:

"Save as otherwise provided in the rules, no business not included in the list of business for the day shall be transacted at any meeting without the leave of the Speaker".

Here we find a resolution which has been spoken of on the last occasion. Rightly or wrongly it has been included now. If a difficulty should now arise and cannot be resolved, I would only submit that there is discretion vested with the Speaker to see that the business is held up. A decision whether the matter can come up or not would have to be taken.

†Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA (Chikodi).—I am inclined to partly agree with Hon'ble Sri Puttaswamy and partly with Sri Baliga. The position appears to be that so far as the operative portion of Rule 29 is concerned, there is no dispute as to the survival of the resolution in question after the prorogation of the last session. The question is whether the present resolution can be brought for discussion before the House without that being entered into the ballot. It appears that without ballot a resolution cannot come up for discussion. I submit that rule 29 is concerned with the business in the same session and not in different sessions. The position is clear from the construction of the language implied in rules 29 and 60. Rule 29 refers only to

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA)

days given for Private Members business in the same session and not in different sessions. Rule 30 makes a reference to an adjournment in the same or next session, whereas the same expressions do not find a place in rule 29.....

Sri C.M. ARUMUGHAM.—Let us take up this non-official business on Monday and discuss the whole of today this point Sir. (Laughter). We have a number of resolutions in the list and I do not know when they will at all come up for discussion. Every time it happens that only one resolution is discussed for days together and that the other resolutions lapse. We have two lists before us and much time is being taken by discussion of a point of order itself.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point before us is whether the resolution can or cannot come before the House. If it is upheld that the resolution cannot come, the entire thing goes out and there can be no discussion of the resolution. The matter is fundamental and has to be settled before we can proceed with the discussion on the merits of the resolution. As to whether more time should be given or not for discussion of the resolutions it is a different matter altogether.

\* Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—I was saying that the provisions of rule 29 apply to the days of the same session and not in different sessions. This can be seen from the fact that the words 'same or next session' are used in sub-rule (1) of Rule 30. I think if we closely read rule 29...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please be brief.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—I shall be very brief. I think that rule 30 (1) and 30 (2) refer to different aspects. Rule 30 (1) speaks of a motion which specifically seeks to adjourn the consideration of a subject under debate to the next day. The motion under sub-rule 2 contemplates a motion which adjourns the debate *sine die*. These two are different. One adjourns the business to the next day and the other seeks to adjourn *sine die*. Rule 30 speaks of the same session or the next session. Rule 29 is meant to operate in respect of the same session. The proviso

to rule 29 can come into operation only when the resolution is under discussion in the course of the same session and not otherwise. Therefore my submission is that under rule 28 (5), a resolution should have been determined by ballot and failure to do so has caused an irregularity. I am afraid a fresh ballot has to be taken and I submit the precedence allowed to this resolution is not proper.

As regards the operation of rule 31(3) I differ from the statement made by Sri Baliga. Sub-rule (3) says that the business which is not mentioned in the list of business cannot be taken up without the leave of the Speaker and so this rule does not apply at all. The business is mentioned and so the question of taking up business which is not mentioned in the list does not arise. Therefore the resolution of Sri Ramappa cannot be taken up. A fresh ballot will have to be taken in respect of resolutions and the result is that there is no work for the House today.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I would like to support the point of order raised by Sri Puttaswamy. The point of order is in my opinion a very valid one. Instead of merely speaking regarding the expediency or otherwise of taking up this resolution, it is much better that we adhere to the rules of procedure in force. I want you to kindly note Chapter VI relating to arrangement of business and list of business. When it has to be drawn up, it has to be drawn up in a certain order and in accordance with the rules in force. That is what rule 28 (5) says that the "relative precedence of resolutions shall be determined by ballot held in accordance with the procedure out in Schedule I." Whatever might have been the history of this particular resolution in the previous session, during the present session while arranging the list of business we have to follow a certain procedure and I hope you will follow that procedure so far as these matters are concerned. When it comes to a question of including a resolution, there is no alternative except to follow the provisions of sub-rule (5). The relative precedence of the resolution has to be determined by ballot whatever might

have been its precedence in the previous session. When the sub-rule says that the relative precedence of resolutions shall be determined by ballot held in accordance with the procedure set out in Schedule I, it has to be adhered to. Even for adhering to rule 28 (5) there is a further direction in rule 30 (2) which says:

"When the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, the member in charge of the Bill or the mover of the resolution, as the case may be, may, if he wishes to proceed with such Bill or resolution on a subsequent day allotted for Private Member's business, give notice for resumption of the adjourned debate and on receipt of such notice the relative precedence of such Bill or resolution shall be determined by ballot."

I want you to kindly read the heading of this Chapter and understand the exact implications of rule 28 (5) and rule 30 (2) and put them all together and then there will be no difficulty at all. The member had given notice in the previous session and it had its own precedence then for reasons best known which we cannot discuss today. The Speaker adjourned the entire debate and the session *sine die*. So now the position is that the member must positively give a notice that it should be resumed and even then the relative precedence of the resolution shall be determined by ballot. You can imagine to what ludicrous position we would come to unless we adhere to the rules. Even in the case of an adjourned business the member is required to give notice.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—May I know whether there is any order or direction by the Speaker saying that this particular resolution should be adjourned *sine die*?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is not for the resolution only, but the entire session was adjourned *sine die*. When the session was adjourned *sine die* the member should have given notice for resumption of the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does it mean that if the session was adjourned *sine die* this debate was adjourned *sine die*?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—What I am asking is whether for this resolution there was any direction from the Speaker that it should be adjourned *sine die* because the premises taken by the Hon'ble Minister is that under sub-rule (2) of rule 30 the discussion of the resolution was adjourned *sine die* by the Speaker.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I am drawing my own inference that when the session itself is adjourned *sine die* the whole debate also should be deemed to be adjourned *sine die*.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please tell me what is the difference between rule 30 (1) and rule 30 (2). Rule 30 (1) says "when on a motion being carried the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned to the next day..." Rule 30 (2) says "When the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*..."

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Rule 30 (1) speaks about an entirely different set of circumstances. There should be a motion and it should be carried, but sub-rule (2) contemplates an entirely different set of circumstances where the Speaker adjourns the session itself *sine die*.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It does not mean that in one case the adjournment is to the next day and in the other it is *sine die*.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We are not discussing the situation under rule 30 (1) because there was no motion when the House adjourned then. But when the session is adjourned *sine die* all proceedings are adjourned *sine die*.

Mr. SPEAKER.—"On a motion" covers both the classes of adjournment.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It does not cover. We can contemplate two situations—one when there is a motion for adjournment and the other when the House itself adjourns *sine die*. There are two sets of circumstances and so we should not confuse one with the other and we should not bring in Rule 30 (1) in view of the particular situation that has arisen. Whatever it may be, if it is to be put down in the list of business

(SRI T. MARIAPPA)

the relative precedence of the resolution shall be determined by ballot held in accordance with the procedure set out in Schedule I. Therefore, rule 28 (5) is supreme and it is mandatory and sub-rule (2) of rule 30 is incidental. If both of them are read in juxtaposition you will be able to hold that this resolution cannot be taken up today. If a fresh ballot is taken and then this resolution gains relative precedence, in that case we have no objection. So, Sir, the point of order raised and the arguments advanced by my friend Sri Baliga both go to show that the continuance of this discussion today will not be in order.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA (Holenarasipur).—Sir, After hearing carefully the arguments advanced by the Finance Minister and Sri Baliga I feel that this resolution has undergone all the formalities enunciated in Chapter XV and then it was also discussed for some time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You come to the point.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—The acid test that you have to apply is whether it subsists or is abrogated as a consequence of prorogation of the Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please reply to the points raised here.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—As the debate was not over and as the debate had already commenced, I think it is still subsisting inasmuch as it has already undergone all the formalities enunciated in Chapter XV and so I think the discussion must be allowed today.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have not caught what the other side has said. It is not disputed that it subsists, but they say that it should have come through the ballot for relative precedence.

11 A.M.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—If that is the argument against this resolution, then as my friends have already suggested, we seek protection under clause (3) of rule 31.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It does not apply at all because it is already included in the list. The main point is, whether

there is necessity of the motion being balloted again.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—It need not be, for it has undergone all these formalities.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, lawyers see a lot of confusion in these things. I am also a lawyer but we shall apply the lay-man's mind to this question. There are two stages for a resolution; one which is not discussed and the other which is partly discussed. Let us take the case of a number of resolutions which have not been taken up at all and which go to the next session. It is but natural that a ballot has got to be taken in that case. Supposing, a resolution is 3/4ths discussed; it does not lapse. The life is there.

Proviso to 29 is: "Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in rules 28 and 29 any such business which is under discussion....."

That is, it has been partly discussed at the end of the day and it shall be set down for the next day allotted to the business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business set down for that day. Sir, it does not say the same session. This has been discussed and this has to be discussed the next day, either of the same session or next session. No question of notice will arise in the matter. Rule 30 does not apply to such a situation at all. It does not apply to a resolution which is half discussed. The proviso does not say either this session or that session; it may be any session.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Supposing, tomorrow or day after tomorrow it is carried, it is all right. But, when the House is adjourned *sine die*, a new situation arises.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—For that, I refer to rule 17. It does not lapse and the situation which was existing at that moment subsists; the life remains. At the moment of adjournment of the session, we were at a situation and that situation exists.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—When there is adjournment *sine die*? In this case also there is adjournment *sine die*.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—It is not so.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಗೂರ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ಗಾಗಲೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ವೇಳೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯುವ ಬದಲು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಲಿ. ಅವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಗಡಿಬಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, as I said rule 29 refers to a resolution which is partly discussed. Rule 30 refers to a resolution which is not begun at all. For such a thing, ballot has to be taken. Rule 30 (2) says under what circumstances this should be done.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The word 'resolution' means, it was under debate; subsequently, it has to be resumed.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Unfortunately, the Treasury Benches are against this resolution being taken up.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am only guided by the Rules of Procedure. I want only the interpretation.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, when certain resolutions have been pending which are adjourned from the previous session, they do not automatically come into ballot. If a member wishes that this resolution must come up for discussion, then sub-rule 2 says: "when the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, the member in charge of the Bill or the mover of the resolution, as the case may be, may, if he wishes to proceed with such Bill or resolution on a subsequent day allotted for Private Member's business, give notice for resumption ...."

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The word resolution is very important.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—This applies only if the member wishes to proceed with the Bill. I will make a distinction. There is no question of proceeding at all here. When a Bill or Resolution is partly discussed, it is in the air; you cannot put it this way or that way. It is a resolution; it is no discussion at all.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Option is given to the member to resume the debate.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—When it is discussed in part, there is no question of option. Under the proviso to rule 29, it has to be taken up automatically. But when a resolution is not taken up for discussion at all, then sub-rule (2) of rule 30 comes in.

"When the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, the member in charge of the Bill or the mover of the resolution, as the case may be, may, if he wishes to proceed with such Bill or Resolution on a subsequent day allotted for Private Member's Business, give notice for resumption of the adjourned debate,....."

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Even in such a case the ballot is necessary.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Only when a discussion has not commenced, this sub-rule (1) or (2) of rule 30 comes into operation. As far as I am concerned, I feel there is no confusion at all. There are two categories of resolutions: one partly discussed and one not discussed at all. When a portion of discussion has already taken place, proviso to rule 29 says that it shall be taken up on the next day. When the resolution is not taken up it is left to his sweet will and pleasure either to give notice to take it up or to allow it to go by default. This resolution was taken up and partly discussed. No question of notice arises; no question of ballot arises.

†Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palayam).—I support the opinion expressed by my friend the Leader of the Opposition. The Finance Minister was banging on sub-rule (5) of rule 28; but it is controlled by the proviso to rule 29. When it is partly or incompletely discussed, it should have precedence over the other subjects set apart for the next day. But sub-rules (1) and (2) of rule 30 come into operation in a different set of circumstances. If a particular member has sent a resolution for the purpose of discussing it and if it is not taken up and if that particular member intends that his resolution must be taken up in the next session also, he must move a motion for the



(SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

purpose of that subject being carried to the next day. In such a case he is to give notice and that is to be followed. That is what is conveyed by sub-rules (1) and (2). Further, sub-rule (2) is interlinked with sub-rule (1). The proviso to rule 29 says "any such business which is under discussion...". But it is not apparent in rule 30 (1) and (2) that only to those subjects for which a motion has been moved and those subjects carried on to the next session on a motion moved, sub-rules (1) and (2) would apply. Whenever a subject is discussed partly or incompletely, the proviso controls the situation and it has got to gain precedence over the other subjects. When a subject matter has been sent and not debated upon, to indicate the intention of the member who brought the subject, he may give a notice or move a motion so that this subject will be carried on to the next session and then only sub-rule (2) would come into operation. It does not apply to those subjects which are already under discussion and when they are not completed. Therefore, I submit that the subject which has been discussed partly is subsisting and the proviso to rule 29 gives precedence to it over the other subjects. Sub-rules (1) and (2) of rule 30 would come into operation under a different set of circumstances. Therefore, we cannot take into consideration sub-rules (1) and (2) so far as the debate on this resolution is concerned. Proviso to rule 29 is conclusive and therefore, the subject under discussion gains precedence and no question of giving a notice comes into the picture. We can naturally imagine when a subject is sent for discussion and partly discussed, we do not contemplate giving a notice; we feel that it will be taken up again in the ordinary course of events that is to come and the proviso to rule 29 is conclusive in this matter. What Sri V. Srinivasa Setty expressed stands to reason. Therefore, this subject has got to be taken into consideration.

[SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If you refer to rule 17, it not merely says that a resolution shall not lapse by reason

only of the prorogation of the Assembly, but it also refers to a motion or an amendment. If the interpretations of the Finance Minister were to be accepted, then there would be an invidious distinction between a motion and an amendment. All the difficulties which the Finance Minister wants us to have in view in relation to a resolution would not be applicable to a motion or an amendment. Such an invidious distinction was never contemplated when the rules were framed. After all, a motion or an amendment or a resolution ought to be put on the same footing for procedural purpose. But if we accept the interpretation of the Finance Minister in our anxiety to rule out this motion, we will be accepting the position that so far as motion and amendment are concerned, these restrictions will not apply, the question of ballot will not apply, the normal procedure in relation to motion and amendment will not come in, but the normal procedure only with regard to motion will apply. That is an absurd position which I do not accept. It is true as contended by the Finance Minister, under rule 28 (5), the question of ballot is prescribed. The same thing is said in rule 30 (1) and (2) and rule 28 (5). There is no distinction at all. The point is this. If we should give full effect to the words 'shall not lapse' we have got to see that all those things which prevent giving effect to the right of a member in respect of lapsing of resolutions should not be given full effect. On the other hand, the first one, namely rule 17 must be given full effect. Supposing we try to read it along with rules 28(5) and 30(1) in the manner read by the Finance Minister, then we will not be giving full effect to the right vested under rule 17.

Secondly, the contention that rule 29 refers to only one session and it does not refer to two sessions, is wrong. Please read the first portion of rule 29—the words "shall not be set down for any subsequent day". I emphasise the word 'any'. If it is any subsequent day, it may not merely mean any subsequent day in the current session but any subsequent day in any further session. Because of that I feel that

rule 29 with the proviso is definitely operative.

Thirdly, as contended by my friend, rule 30 (2) is applicable in a different situation. Here is a right vested in the mover of a resolution. What is contemplated is this. A resolution would have been moved; some other members would have spoken and at that stage the session might have been adjourned; at that stage the mover could carry it over to a subsequent session. That is what it says. One more thing. Nowhere is it laid down that if this particular procedure is not followed, if a ballot is not taken, it becomes null and void. If what I say is not correct, my own feeling is, this that at best conceding to be very fair to the Finance Minister, we can only come to one conclusion that there is some contradiction in the rules. But I submit that the situation of a resolution which has not lapsed is not at all provided for either in rule 30 (1) or in rule 29. That is the most convenient interpretation that we can give, in such a situation where it is not provided for clearly in the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 28 (5) provides for it.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—It is a general rule applicable to all resolutions. Another point is if you adopt 30 (2), as suggested by the Finance Minister, 15 days' notice is needed in the case of carried—over resolution also. Rule 17 will be null and void and inoperative.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—You can dispense with fresh notice of resolution, but all other procedure of balloting does apply.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Notice has subsequently been defined in respect of resolutions as 15 days. It does not distinguish resolutions notice of which has been freshly given and resolutions which have been carried over from the previous session. If that interpretation is to be given, then it is absolutely wrong. In Parliamentary affairs, the constitutional position in relation to what happens after prorogation is discussed. In all our parliaments and Houses of Legislature, it has been definitely held that they will be automatically and *sou motu* carried over. I feel that the resolution is in order,

† Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I followed the discussion and also I have gone through the relevant rules. The relevant rules for the disposal of this point of order are rules 17, 28, 29 and 30. Rule 17 reads like this :

"A motion, resolution or an amendment, which has been moved and is pending in the Assembly, shall not lapse by reason only of the prorogation of the Assembly."

That means it can lapse otherwise. It cannot lapse only by reason of the fact that the Assembly has been prorogued. The wording is clear. Sri Baliga pointed out that this rule is subject to what has been stated in rules 28, 29 and 30. So, rule 17 is subject to what has been stated in the subsequent rules. Sub rule (5) of rule 28 makes it clear that a ballot is necessary in arranging the precedence of resolutions. Rule 29 applies to debates going on in the same session. Rule 29 reads like this :

"Private Members' business set down for the day allotted for that class of business and not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day, unless it has gained priority at the ballot held with reference to that day."

Mr. SPEAKER.—where is it said that it applies to adjourned sessions ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—When we read the two rules together, rules 29 and 30, it is obvious that rule 29 applies to the same session and rule 30 applies to an adjourned session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How have you come to the conclusion that rule 29 applies to the same session and not to two different sessions ? Rule 29 relates to resolutions which have been discussed.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I will read the rule once again :

"Private Members' business set down for the day allotted for that class of business and not disposed of on that day shall not be set down for any subsequent day, unless it has gained priority at the

(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

ballot held with reference to that day."

Here the ballot was not held and it does not arise. The proviso says :

"Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in rules 28 and 29 any such business which is under discussion at the end of that day shall be set down for the next day allotted to business of that class, and shall have precedence over all other business set down for that day."

'Shall be set down for the next day allotted to business of that class' means during the session and not another session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How can you say that?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I respectfully submit that it does not apply to any other session. I will read rule 30 which is as follows :

"When on an motion being carried the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned to the next day allotted for Private Members' business in the same or next session, it will not be set down for further discussion unless it has gained priority at the ballot."

The next sub-clause does not apply to the next day but to 'any day'. In the second sub-clause it is '*sine die*'. sub-clause (2) says :

"When the debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, the Member in charge of the Bill or the mover of the resolution, as the case may be, may, if he wishes to proceed with such Bill or resolution on a subsequent day allotted for Private Member's business, give notice for resumption...."

So, he should give notice. I wish to submit one thing, that a debate can be either adjourned or it can be ended. There are only two methods. Is there any third alternative? If it is the

contention of the Hon'ble Members on the other side that this debate which was commenced on that day was not adjourned, that means it lapses. There is no other alternative. Either the debate should conclude or lapse or it should adjourn. If sub-clause (2) of rule 30 applies, no notice has been given by the Hon'ble Member in charge of the resolution and therefore it lapses.

11-30 A.M.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Why should he give notice?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We are governed by the rules. Under these circumstances I beg to submit that the resolution has lapsed and it cannot be taken up today.

†Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Sir, many things can be undone, but the discretion of the Speaker cannot be taken away. We are laying a precedent and therefore we have to be careful. I have tabled an amendment to the resolution. I am only concerned as to whether the amendment has life or not. Unfortunately, I find there is a misconception in placing this matter before the House. I feel it should not have found a place in this list. Rules 17 and 18 do not admit much room for interpretation. The question is when a resolution lapses and when it does not lapse, and if it does not lapse what precedence it should get. Now we are concerned with whether rule 29 or rule 30 should prevail and whether there is any conflict between rules 29 and 30. To my mind, there is no inconsistency between the two. Rule 29 specifically refers to that day and therefore it is confined necessarily to that session. The emphasis is on that particular session. Under rule 29 no question of the next session arises. Any reference to rule 29 is only with regard to that particular session. The question of 'next session' arises only under rule 30.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not saying that rule 29 applies to the next session or the present session. I am trying to understand why it should not apply to the next session also.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.— cannot apply because it does not refer to the next session. The rule is not so ambiguous as is made out and there is no occasion for the exercise of the discretion of the Chair. Why is this omission of the next session in rule 29? Why should rule 30 contain a provision for the next session?

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—It does not refer to the subject under discussion.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.— Here we are concerned with the resumption of the debate. Rule 30 allows resumption of debate which was left out in the previous session. The question of resuming the debate conflicts with rule 30. There is no provision for resumption under any other rule. The only conclusion we can come to is that the omission of the next session in rule 29 is deliberate. The emphasis on the same or the next session in rule 30 indicates that only rule 30 applies and therefore there is no question of carrying it to the next session unless fresh notice is given and it gains precedence.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).— Hon'ble Members of the Treasury Benches are opposing the resolution because they do not want a discussion on the subject now.

Regarding the preparation of the list of business a lot of discretion is vested in the Speaker under rule 31(3) and also under rule 325. You are aware that as many as 50 members of this House have given notice of this resolution and that is clear proof of the wishes of the members. So we request you to allow the discussion to continue.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What about the point of law?

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—I am not now speaking on the point of law. I want you to use your discretion in this matter because the matter is under dispute and a lot of discretion is given to you under rules 31(3) and 325. If the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition and other members on this side are not convincing, I request you to use your discretion and allow the discussion to continue.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard with great patience both sides. I have also

tried to apply my mind as far as possible to the situation. I am really thankful to both sides for enlightening me on the point raised before us. I have to come to my own conclusion on the point raised. It may be that that conclusion may not be to the taste of some members or may be that it may not be so logical according to the views of some members. I have to request members to read rules 17, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 277 of which most of the members have not taken notice. Rule 277 says :

"At any time after a motion has been made, a member may move that the debate on the motion be adjourned."

This rule contemplates a motion for adjournment of the debate. If a debate is going on and if the members want the debate to be not concluded and prefer it to be dragged on, they have to make a motion under rule 277 which says :

"At any time after a motion has been made, a member may move that the debate on the motion be adjourned."

After reading that rule, Hon'ble Members will have to read the other rules, 30, 29, 28 and 17. I read rule 17 :

"A motion, resolution or an amendment, which has been moved and is pending in the Assembly, shall not lapse by reason only of the prorogation of the Assembly."

The wording used is "by reason *only* of the prorogation..." Even then it cannot be said that the last session of the Assembly was prorogued, and the present session has been called after the prorogation of the last session. Hon'ble Members cannot argue saying that the last session was adjourned *sine die* and yet this session has been called. Both cannot happen. Either they will have to say that the last session was prorogued and this session has been called or they will have to say that the last session was adjourned and this session is a continuation of the last session. This distinction is very clear

(MR. SPEAKER)

that prorogation means one thing and adjournment means another thing. If it is a fact that the Governor was pleased to prorogue the last session, but the motion of the Hon'ble Member Sri Ramappa does not lapse but subsists. If it subsists, we have to read rule 30. Rule 30(1) says:

"When on a motion being carried debate on a Private Member's Bill or resolution is adjourned to the next day allotted for Private Members' business in the same or next session, it will not be set down for further discussion unless it has gained priority at the ballot."

Rule 30(2) says:

"When the debate on a Private member's Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, the member in charge of the Bill or the mover of the resolution, as the case may be, may, if he wishes to proceed with such Bill or resolution on a subsequent day allotted for private members' business, give notice for resumption of the adjourned debate and on receipt of such notice the relative precedence of such Bill or resolution shall be determined by ballot."

The difference between sub-rule (1) and sub-rule (2) of rule 30 is to the effect that in one case in sub-rule (1) it is not necessary that a notice should be given, but ballot will have to take place, and in the other case, sub-rule (2), if it is adjourned *sine die* the member will have to give notice and thereafter the ballot takes place. I will make it still clear. Under sub-rule (1) no notice is necessary, but under sub-rule (2) notice is necessary and in both cases it is necessary that the ballot will have to be held. After making this position clear, I can point out that under sub-rule (1) a motion for adjournment of the debate has to be made to a particular day, i.e., to the next day. That goes without saying.

The other point is even where the debate is adjourned *sine die*, a fresh

ballot is necessary for determining the relative precedence under sub-rule (2). That is the position. Some of the Hon'ble Members took the view that since the last session of the Assembly was adjourned, naturally everything was adjourned *sine die* and that is why fresh notice has to be given and a fresh ballot has to take place. I have already pointed out that the last session was not adjourned *sine die*. But it was prorogued. If it was prorogued, even according to them sub-rule (2) of rule 30, does not apply.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I said the debate adjourned *sine die*. Either the debate is concluded or it is adjourned *sine die*.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am replying to another Hon'ble Member and not to your argument. It is not open to Hon'ble Members to say that the last session was adjourned *sine die* and so the motion made by Sri Ramappa also was adjourned *sine die*. That argument cannot hold water. The session was prorogued. If it is prorogued, rule 17 applies and the motion still subsists.

So far as ballot under rule 28 is concerned, it does not apply to those resolutions which are under discussion in this House. It only applies to resolutions which are pertaining to a particular session, i.e., new resolutions altogether and that being so it is not necessary under rule 28 that Sri Ramappa's resolution should go into the ballot. If rule 30(1) or 30(2) applies, then Sri Ramappa's resolution would have to go to ballot and notice would be necessary. I have already said that there has been no difference of opinion so far as the operation of rule 30(1) is concerned.

The difference of opinion arises only in respect of rule 30 (2). It is impossible for me to read sub-rule (2) without reference to sub-rule (1).

There is also some background for my view because some similar cases have occurred in the Lok Sabha as well I will read one of them here to make my position clear:

On the 7th February 1947, which was the first non-official day for resolutions in the Budget

Session 1947, the question was raised by several Members including Pandit Govind Malaviya why the latter's resolution regarding the release of I.N.A. men (the discussion on which had been adjourned to the present session on a motion adopted by the Assembly during the preceding session) had not been included in the List of Business for the day.

There was a motion to adjourn it from the previous session to the current session. So it is necessary either under sub-rule (1) or under sub-rule (2) that there should be a motion for adjournment of the debate to the next day or *sine die*. That is quite clear.

There is another similar cases for the Lok Sabha :

"Shri Subiman Ghose moved the following Resolution on 19th December 1958.

Shri Subiman Ghose's speech was not concluded. The resolution was taken up again in the next session on February 13, 1959. On that day two amendments were moved by Sarvashri Shree Narayan Das and Rajendra Singh. Shri Subiman Ghose concluded his speech on the resolution moved by him on 19th December 1958."

So it will be noticed that it is only in peculiar circumstances that when a motion for adjournment is made the question of notice and ballot arises.

Some cases occurred in this House, under similar circumstances. Our new Rules came into operation on the 18th November 1958. I am reading the proceedings of this House on 1st December 1958. Sri Kenchappa moved a certain resolution on that day and it was taken up again on the 1st April 1959 without any objection being taken. Clearly they were two different sessions. The previous session was on 1st December 1958 and the next one was in April 1959. That means the December session must have been prorogued. So it will be seen that we

have now an identical situation as the one that was prevailing between 1st December 1958 and April 1959.

12 NOON.

It will be clear from all these that the resolution of Sri M. Ramappa subsists. When it subsists, it must have the precedence. That is why today, it has been included in the list of business. I thank the Hon'ble Members for giving me an opportunity to go through the whole question and convince myself of the real position in this regard. I therefore rule that the motion moved by Sri Ramappa subsists and therefore gets precedence over any other resolution.

**Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU** (Cubbonpet).—Sir, you are pleased to give a ruling on this issue. This takes us to another important issue. I wanted to ask whether my amendment would survive or not. But, now that I got fresh light, I would like to know as to what happens to my amendment to the resolution of Sri Ramappa.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The Hon'ble Member's amendment was not moved at all and so, it would not subsist. But, I have no objection to accept a fresh amendment if it is given now.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟ (ರೋಣ).**—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಈಗ ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದ್ವೈತದಿಗಿಳಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿನ್ನೂ ಇದೆಯೇ?

**ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.**—ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ: ಕೊಡಬಹುದು.

**Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.**—I move the amendment, Sir.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I propose to the House the amendment of Sri Deenadayalu Naidu which is as follows :

"(1) In lines 1 to 3 for the words "is of the opinion that a recommendation be made to the Government of India to take necessary steps urgently to change" substitute "reiterates emphatically".

"(2) In lines 3 and 4 between the words "to" and "Karnatak State" add "the proposed name of",



**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (K.G.F.).—**Sir, I want to raise an objection. This amendment takes away the whole spirit of the resolution. The existing name is Mysore; there is no dispute about it. The mover of the resolution wants a change. What the amendment wants is totally to wipe out the spirit of the resolution. No negative amendment is admissible under our rules.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Let us proceed. Since objection has been taken, I will look into it.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ (ಹರಿಹರ).**—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದು ಮಾನಸಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನೋಡದೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಘಟನಾತ್ಮಕ ಅಥವಾ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟೇನೆ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗ ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಿಂದ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಏನು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಒಂದು ವಾದ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಗೆ ಅರ್ಥಕದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈಗ ನಾನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅರ್ಥಕ ಸಚಿವರು ಏಕೀಕರಣವಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಮಾನಸಿಕ ಇಂಟಿಗ್ರೇಷನ್ ಮಾತ್ರ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ನಾನೀಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲಿಟ್ಟು ಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಮೊಟ್ಟ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವೆಂಬುದೇ ನನ್ನ ಅಸೆ. ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಸರನ್ನಿಡತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ (3)ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಒಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹೆಸರು ಇಂಥಾದ್ದೇ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾರ್ಯಾರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಶೇಖರಿಸುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ, ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಯಾರಿಗಿದೆ, ಒಂದು ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್‌ನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಅತ್ತಕಡೆಗೆ ಸೆಳೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದಿಟ್ಟು ಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

3. "Parliament may by law—

(a) form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States or by uniting any territory to a part of any State;

(e) alter the name of any State:

Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in

either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President and unless where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the area, boundaries or name of any of the States \*\*\*\* the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its views thereon within such period as may be specified in the reference or within such further period as the President may allow and the period so specified or allowed has expired."

So, in respect of the alteration of the name of any State, the views of the Legislature of the State should be ascertained by the President.

**Sri T. D. MARANNA.**—Does the Hon'ble Member mean to say that we do not know that provision in the Constitution.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—You cannot take such objection.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.**—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿದಿರಬಹುದು. ಸರ್ವ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪಾವಿಷನ್ ಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಾವು ಓದಿದ್ದೀರಾ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಬಾರದು. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಸರು ಇಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡನಂತರ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಒಂದು ವಿಶೇಷವಾದಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಬಾರಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂತು. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದರು; ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದು ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಏತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತರಬೇಕು. ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು. ಆದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಇಷ್ಟೇ; ಒಂದು ದೇಶದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷ ಆಗಲೇ, ಎಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷ ಆಗಲೇ ಇಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದಮೇಲೆ ಏಕೆ ತರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳು

ವುದು ಸಾಧುವಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳು... ..

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಬೇರೆ ಆದ ಮೇಲೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಯುನೈಟೆಡ್ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.—ಇದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಬಹುಮತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಪಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇಚ್ಛೆ. ಇದು ಸರಿಯೇ, ತಪ್ಪೆ, ಎಂದು ವಾದ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಚಾರವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ಇಚ್ಛೆಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ. ಇದು ಸರಿಯೇ, ತಪ್ಪೆ ಎಂದು ವಕೀಲರ ಹಾಗೆ ವಾದಮಾಡುವ ವಿಷಯವಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬಹುಸಂಖ್ಯಾತ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಗೆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರೂಪಿತವಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ನಾವು ಏಕೆ ಬಹುಮತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು! ಇದನ್ನು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿರುವ ಅಥವಾ ರಾಜಕೀಯಕ್ಕೆ ಇದನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತಿಳಿಸುವ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಏಕೆ ವಿರೋಧಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದು ಇರಲೇಬೇಕು, ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದು ಉಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಹೋರಾಟ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ ಎಂದೆನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಏನೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಡೆಮಾಕ್ರಸಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಸಿಸ್ಟಮ್‌ಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಪೂಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಹತ್ವ ಇದೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೂ ಸಹ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರಿಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಮ್ಯುನಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಂಸತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳು ಇವೆಯೋ ಆ ಎರಡು ಪಕ್ಷದವರೂ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರಿಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೆಲವಾರು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳು ನಿಷ್ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಸಂಕುಚಿತ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದೇ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಏಕೆ ಮಹತ್ವ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾರೋ ಕೆಲವು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳು ವಾದ ಮಾಡುವವರು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬಹುದು ಅಥವಾ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬಹುದು ಆಂಥಾ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆರೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು. Political party is greater than the individual. ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಗಳೆದರೆ ಅದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಗಳೆದ ಹಾಗೆ. ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ

ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಬೆರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎನಾ, ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಡೆಮಾಕ್ರಸಿ ಅಥವಾ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಸಿಸ್ಟಮ್ ಆಫ್ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ದೊಡ್ಡ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿರುವಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ಪುನಃ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಆಶಯ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರು ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಾಂತ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಿವರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಕೇಳಬಹುದು. ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಘಟನಾತ್ಮಕವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಗುವು ಜನನ ಆದಾಗ ತಂದೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಮಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಮಗು ತಂದೆಯ ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಂದೆಯ ಇಚ್ಛೆಯಂತೆ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸುವುದು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಕೊನೆಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ತಂದೆಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕೇ ಎನಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸುವುದು ಘಟನಾತ್ಮಕವಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯ ರೂಪಿತವಾದಾಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಯಾವ ರಾಜಕೀಯವೂ ಬರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೋರಾಡಿ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರು ಇರಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ಜನ ತ್ಯಾಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೇವಲ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಮಹತ್ವ ಕೊಡದೆ ಇರುವುದು ವಿಷಾದಕರ. ಅರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಹತ್ವ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಇಡುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬರಬೇಕು! ಅನೇಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅದು ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಹೆಸರಿಗಾಗಿ ಏಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬರಬೇಕು? ಇದರಿಂದೇನು ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಮೇಲ್ನೋಟದಿಂದ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನೇಕ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಆತಂಕಗಳು, ವಿರೋಧಗಳು ಆಗುವುದು ನಿಜ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸು ವಿಶಾಲವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಆದರಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಷ್ಟು ವಿಶಾಲ ಮನೋ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ, ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಯಾಗದಂತೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಷ್ಟು ವಿರಸಕ್ಕೆ ಎಡೆಕೊಡ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ)

ಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು “ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ” ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವಿರಸವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ, ಇದರಿಂದ ವಿರಸ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ವಿಶಾಲಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಎನ್ನುತ್ತಾ ಹೆಸರು ಹೇಗೆ ಬಂತು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಇತಿಹಾಸದ ವಿಷಯ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಲು ಇಚ್ಛೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಯಾವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿಯಾದರೂ ಬರಲಿ ಅದು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಕೇವಲ ಏಳೆಂಟು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳ ಹೆಸರಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದು ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳ ಹೆಸರಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಅನೇಕ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳ ಭಾಗಗಳು ಬಂದು ಸೇರಿವೆ. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಬಹು ಭಾಗ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 60-70ರಷ್ಟು ಮಂದಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಹೆಸರು ಬೇಡ, ಬೇರೆ ಹೆಸರಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕವರೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಹೆಸರು ಕೇವಲ ಏಳೆಂಟು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳ ಹೆಸರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಈ ಹೆಸರು ಏತಕ್ಕಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದರೇನೋ ಸಣ್ಣ Feudalistic State ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಹೆಸರೇಕೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದು Feudalistic State ನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ Represent ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ಭಾವನೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಹೆಸರು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. “ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ” ಎನ್ನುವ ಹೆಸರು ನಮಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಫೂರ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಎಲ್ಲ ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸೇರಿಸುವಾಗ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಏಕೀಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋರಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದವರೂ ಈ “ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ” ವೆಂಬ ಹೆಸರು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದೇ ಹೋರಾಡಿರರು. ನನಗಾದರೂ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಬರೀಯ “ಮೈಸೂರು” ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೋರಾಟ ನಡೆಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. “ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ” ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದು ಶಬ್ದದ ಹಿಂದೆ ಏನು ಒಂದು ಆಕಾಂಕ್ಷೆ ಇತ್ತು, ಏನು ವಿಶ್ವಾಸವಿತ್ತು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದೇ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಹೋರಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಇಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಕೇವಲ ಕೆಲವು ಮುಖಂಡರು ದೆಹಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಡೆಯ ಜನರೂ

ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಈ “ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸ್ಟೇಟು” ಎಂದು ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದೇ ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನರೂ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿನ ಕೇವಲ ಮೂರು-ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ನಾಯಕರು ಮೈಸೂರೇ ಇರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಇದು ತಮಗಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಷಯ. ಎರಡು ಕಡೆಯ ಜನರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಎಲ್ಲ ಭಾಗಗಳ ಜನರೂ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ “ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ” ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರಿಟ್ಟರೆ, ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಈ ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತ್ಯಾಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಾರ್ಥಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಚ್ಛೆ ಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿನ ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದು ಇತಿಹಾಸದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು. ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕವಾಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕಿರದಷ್ಟು ಆರ್ಗ್ಯುಮೆಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಆರ್ಗ್ಯುಮೆಂಟು ಮಾಡಲು ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಪೈಕಿ 60 ರಿಂದ 70 ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೇಲಿಟ್ಟು ಬಹು ಭಾಗದವರು “ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ” ಎನ್ನುವ ಹೆಸರಿರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಖಚಿತವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ನಾವು ಕೇವಲ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ತಾವು ಯಾರೂ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಎನ್ನುವ ಹೆಸರು ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಒಳಜಗಳಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಯುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಂತೆ ನಿರ್ಧಾರವಾದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಅಡ್ಡಿಯೂ ಆಗದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟು ಈ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸರಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಜಾಗೃತಿಯಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ “ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ” ಎನ್ನುವ ಹೆಸರು ಬರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಆಶಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the House will rise and meet at 1 P.M. on Monday, the 14th December 1959.

*The House adjourned at Thirty Minutes past Twelve of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Monday, the 14th December 1959.*